Testimony of Robert Piton

Arizona Public Hearing on Evidence for Election Fraud

Hosted by Members of the Legislature of the State of Arizona

November 30, 2020

Robert Piton, Representative Mark Finchem (Chairman), Mayor Rudy Giuliani,

Unofficial Transcript

BY MR. FINCHEM: Next up, we have Mr. Robert Piton. If you would, please, Mr. Piton, come up to the table here. Announce your name, who you're with, give like, just ten seconds of what you're going to show us, and if you can, we're running short on time, so brevity is our friend. Thank you very much.

MR. PITON: I'll try to go as quickly as possible. First of all, thank you very much for taking the time to hold this hearing, and I appreciate having the opportunity to speak, so thank you very much. I'd like to start by saying, just quoting something from the Federalist Papers which was written over 200 years ago. It was item No. 68.

> "Nothing was more to be desired than that every practical obstacle should be opposed to cabal, intrigue, and corruption. These most deadly adversaries of republican government might naturally have been expected to make their approaches from more than one quarter, but chiefly from the desire in foreign powers to gain an improper ascendant in our councils."

In my humble opinion, upon reviewing all the data that I'm going to go over, and reading countless articles, clips, and videos over the past week, I think this is the biggest fraud in the history of our constitutional republic. It's taking place right before our eyes. The corrupt mainstream media and tech oligarchs are colluding in an attempt to assassinate the American public's true legal vote from our President, Donald J. Trump, through corrupt government officials across countless precincts and corrupt state officials and courts.

The evidence will show that President Trump surpassed both FDR and Reagan in the percentage of legal votes, topping 60% when this crime is unveiled. So much of this process has been tainted that it will likely end up before the Supreme Court and allow one electoral vote

per state cast, and hopefully Arizona does its part, and eventually, the 35 of the 50 states will probably vote Republican which will probably match his popular vote totals.

So, with that said, I'm going to -- so basically, what I've identified is that there's between 120,000 and 306,000 fake people. And I did this by looking at the data, and I'm not going to go over this sheet just yet. I want to just kind of just highlight the bigger picture because numbers can be -- I love numbers, but they can be a little boring, so I want to kind of tell the story to the numbers. But basically, what I did is I took a completely different approach than what's been presented up to this point, based on the little that I've heard here, is there's approximately 1,500 precincts in Arizona and there's three classifications for Male, Female, and then, You. I guess, maybe that's the undecided classification. And then there's five different types of voters. There's one, two, three, four, five -- Hard Republican, Moderate, Swing, Moderate Democrat, Hard Democrat. So, there's five categories. And what I did is I looked through the age rolls, so 18 to 100, and I basically created a unique bucket, so to speak, for each of those classifications. So, it turns out there's about 980,000+ unique Arizona voters. And what I did is, I didn't look at the total; I looked at the number of registered voters in the state, because if the core dataset is flawed, everything else that happens afterwards is irrelevant, in my opinion, you know. So, I kind of took an approach of "how is the thing constructed?"

It was a very tedious process to organize all this, but then once I got that organized, I broke out all of the Male one, two, three, four, five votes. So, I want you to think about, like, okay there's five classifications of male voters in the state of Arizona. I summed up and looked at how many of those votes by age -- 18-year-olds, 19-year-olds, 20-year-olds -- across all those different categories, and then I did the same thing for Females. And then I did I the same thing for the You's. And this is -- it was absolutely mind-boggling what popped out as a result of this incredibly tedious process.

The correlation of men that voted in Arizona -- so the first category, the number one voter versus two, one versus three, one versus four, one versus five, you know, making sure that all possible combinations of male voters was accounted for -- the average of those correlations for male voters is approximately 63.83%. That makes sense because, you know, people as they age, they're kind of random. they might fall into -- maybe they're liberal one time; maybe they're conservative the other time. They kind of bounce around. And the variation, the standard deviation is very high, as it should. People's life cycle changes. It's about 30%.

So, then I did the same thing for females. Now, I mean I can ask a silly question, but my wife told me "no jokes." But I'll get to the punchline: Are women more predictable than men when it comes to voting? Are they more independent? Now, first people's first answer seems to be, "oh, they'll do more, their correlation should be higher." And actually, the opposite is true. They're at about 58%. So about six points lower in terms of the correlation, doing the same analysis. And that makes sense because most women don't want to tell you what they're doing when they go into the voting booth. So, that's the joke.

But anyway, so then, what I did is, I did the same thing for the You's. Now, keep in mind, there's a total –

MR. FINCHEM: Excuse me when you say "You's", you're talking about undisclosed, not youths, as in younger?

A.   Yeah. I like that. My Cousin Vinny. Hey, there you go.

MR. FINCHEM: I'm glad you got the joke, Mr. Mayor.

MR. PITON: So, what is a You? So, basically, once I did that, there's 463,660 classified that I found under this category. I did that the same analysis. Now, keep in mind the standard deviation for men was about 32.8%. For women it was about 35.77%. There would be a lot of randomness through time across the aging process of human beings. With regards to the You, when I did that same analysis, 94% + correlation. Let me say that again: 94%t correlation. And I was like, this is insane. This is like, fictitious.

And now, keep in mind I came up with this by going through all 1,500 precincts and unbundling all the data age by age across their sexual -- you know, M, F, and You -- and also what type of voter were they. So, this is -- and I happen to love data, so this was fun for me -- so I'm like, I have an idea of how they're cheating. I think they're cheating. So, I'm going to test this theory out and I'm more than happy to provide this to Mayor Giuliani. And so, it was 94% and so the next thing I did, I was like, oh, well I want to see if something's wrong with the data. What should I do to make sure that I'm not wrong with this, because I don't want to embarrass myself.

So, what I did is I took the buckets and I computed, what does the distribution look like per age. So, like, okay, how many -- when I look at the buckets, how many You's are there in the first type of voter, second, third, fourth, fifth. And what I found is there's about 14,000 across time -- 14,225, and on the Type-1 Republicans. There's 122,203 Type-2's, but what's fascinating is it's almost symmetrical on the Type-4's. So, a 120,000, and I'm like, I asked my son, I'm like hey, what do you think in terms of the user. If you're conservative are you more likely to go unclassified or just throw that in or just fill it out based on your sex? He's like, you fill it out based on your sex.

So then, I looked at that data and I found that it's a bell-shaped curve. So, if you looked at the ages and you went from a 100 to 18, the curve of the data is a nice bell shape. In the middle is 186,202 swing voters. The wings are 122,000 Type-2, 120,000 Type-4, and 14,000

Type-1 and 20,000 Type-5. But here's the kicker: When I'm like, okay, let's unpack each year, so the 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds -- what's that look like?

When I do that and I ran a max function so it's like, obviously zero is the min, and then what's the maximum number of You votes in any given precinct in Arizona? Fair enough. I trade in the markets. I like to see what's the min max, what's the range. I run that number and then I ran the correlation of the maxes versus the what the average number of votes per age group took place, and I ran that correlation. And would you believe it -- it's over 97%. So, it's like holy cow, I think I reverse-engineered the algorithm that they're using to do these damn votes.

But unless you're willing to create 980,000 buckets, you know, you're going to have a hard time seeing it, because everybody's used to doing the data -- you know, bundle it up, only look at the Type-1, look at the Type-2, and you know. And this algorithm, basically what the data's showing, and I think, frankly, this is a call-out to our President Trump: Please, please, please do this for the entire country. I think we deserve an audit of every county in America after seeing this. And so, basically -- so now I'd like to go -- before I even started this Minutia Project -- that's what I call it, the Minutia Project -- this took me over 25 hours to do -- I decided, you know what I like to look at metadata. Metadata, you guys should look into it if you don't know what it is. I don't want to get into a philosophical discussion about it, but metadata is, I say, if I landed in Arizona, I want to understand what's been going on in Arizona before I say anything. And I pulled back on your website; you have 22 years of election results going back to 1998. So, this is what's up here.

So, basically what I did is I went to the census and I pulled the census data on Arizona by each county. So, I looked at 2000; I looked at 2010; I looked at the estimate for 2019, and then you can see, I calculated what the annualized growth rate of each county was and then what the growth rate was from 2000 to 2010, which is column B, and then I looked at Column C,

which is, what was it from 2010 to 2019, and I extrapolated the data for one more year because we don't have the 2020 results. So, I kind of went through this whole process, and I did that before the Minutia and I wanted to see, well, what does the census say with regards to how many people are the of voting age. So, I scrolled down, you can see over here, you know right now, for example 27% of Apache is under the age of 18. This is, once again, I didn't use any of my own data. I used government data so if there's a problem, take it up with the government.

So, basically, I computed what is the number of voters per year. Now, keep in mind, since the census doesn't come out every year, I had to fill in based on the annualized growth rate between each census and, kind of adjust it accordingly, because I don't want to just spitball it; I want it to be tied to the math and make sure that each year filled out. So then, from there, I went in and physically typed in all of the reported eligible voters each year, because, I got to tell you Arizona does not make it easy to standardize -- pull down the data in each county. Anyway, I had to go physically do this, which is time-consuming, but I thought it was extremely important for what I was asked to do, so I did that.

And then I did the reported ballots cast, and then I did that each year for each of the 2-year cycles. And then I typed in the number of precincts that were reported, and then as I kind of do that, you know, I came up with reported, eligible voters as a percentage of the total population. Once I did that, registered eligible voters as a percentage of voting age population. So, here's where it gets interesting. So, I kind of did that and I'm like, okay, I concur with Dr. Shiva that I think voting fraud has been happening in this state, and possibly nationwide, much longer than the past four years. I'm looking at the data and it looks as though it's going back to at least 2008.

So, basically, what I did is I looked at the 2000 Presidential Election -- 2004, 2008. And I looked at all the eligible voters, and that's in Column S here, and I said, okay, how many eligible voters showed up to vote in those three presidential cycles? Then I tied it to 2008,

2012, 2016 as a pivot, and I said wow. It went from 79% in Apache to 86.93%. But then, the change from the average of the 2008, 2012, 2016 presidential cycle went from 87% to 99% of all eligible voters in Apache voted is what the data -- that's how many registered voters there are. It's like, what -- 99%?

So, since I'm in a little bit of a rush I went through and did that for each of the counties and showed what the results look like in each respective Presidential year for three years and then the off years, to compare those two numbers. And the correlation, once again, the difference between those two years -- if it's a Presidential cycle versus a regular cycle, there's about an 88% correlation. That should give you some idea of how meaningful that 94% was.

And so I went through and did that, and then I did the same thing with the ballots cast as a percentage of the total population, ballots cast as a percentage of Arizona population, and a couple things I want to highlight since I'm running out of time: The population of Arizona has gone up by about 1% per year in the past decade. The number of people voting per year has gone up by about 7% per year. Now, that may not seem like a big deal, but if you had a $100,000 and you invested it at 1%, after a decade you would have a $111,000 -- not bad. But if you had a $100,000 and you invested it at 7% for a decade, you'd have a $195,000. So, it's like, wait a second, how is it that you have 95,000 versus 11,000? So, when you look at the differential growth rates, that's how meaningful it is, that this has been occurring going back a decade, that it's almost like a little creep. Somebody was maybe cheating a little bit somewhere and then they needed to cheat a little bit more, and then they needed to cheat a little bit more, and, the reason why I say this is, you know being in the financial markets my whole career -- Sarbanes-Oxley -- remember that? Everybody remember WorldCom -- WorldCom and Enron? They had to sign -- the CFO and the CEO have to sign the financials, the 10-K and 10-Q, which is enforced since the '33 and 1934 Securities Act. Guess

who was exempted from that Act? Counties and states. Maybe they should be not exempted anymore. If you're going to sign something when billions of dollars are on the line, we should believe in the data. We have the CEO's get clawed back. We get the CFO's jail time. So, if you cheat there should be repercussions. And the laws are on the books for this. All we have to do is -- here, I'll give you an example: If you're a CEO of a company that's worth $20 billion and there's a fraud internally, and somebody steels a billion, if you don't prosecute them and you don't uncover it and investigate it, you're violating your fiduciary responsibility. You're going to get fired; you're going to get sued and investors are going to take you through the ringer. But, for some reason in politics that doesn't happen. Which is mind-boggling because this country's worth a hundred-trillion dollars. This election about controlling a hundred-trillion dollars of wealth in the United States is very serious business.

And so, this is one of the reasons -- so I'm kind of, wrapping it up here because I know you asked me to cut it short.

So, the population of Arizona has gone up by 40% since 2000. The number of voters in 1998 in Arizona was 1.1 million. It's 3.2 million today, so it's like tripled, but the population's up 40%. Something's off.

MR. FINCHEM: Thank you, sir. Mayor Giuliani.

BY MAYOR GIULIANI: If you could just tell us in your simplest way possible, as an expert, what is your opinion as to the validity of the numbers that were certified today by the Secretary of State and the Governor about the this election?

A.	If I was an executive at a publicly traded company, I would never sign that because I'd risk jail time and having all my money taken from me in lawsuits. To answer your

question, I would never, ever have certificated -- I'd rather resign than have certificated those results.

Q.   In your professional opinion, is that the numbers of are fraudulent?

A.   I believe they're fraudulent based on the data and my sister asked me a simple question this morning: She goes, how sure are you? And my sister's a pretty stubborn person like me, and I said I'd be willing to put my life on it. I'm that sure about the analysis, assuming that the data that I got from the state and everything else was accurate. So, you know if you give me all inaccurate data from everywhere, that's my only caveat.

Q.   Can you tell us your professional background?

A.   I'm a portfolio manager. I have my CFA since I was 23. I got my MBA from Kellogg in organizational design and strategy. I'm working on a financial engineering degree at the moment. I like math for fun. I believe math is the language of the universe.

Q.   Thank you very much. Very helpful.